UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/565,834	01/25/2006	Kimoon Kim	1751-396	7491
	7590 05/29/200 FIGG, ERNST & MAN	EXAMINER		
1425 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			SAMALA, JAGADISHWAR RAO	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1618	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/29/2008	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-PAT-Email@rfem.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/565,834	KIM ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
JAGADISHWAR R. SAMALA	1618	

	JAGADISHWAR R. SAMALA	1618				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED <u>17 March 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.				
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, wwith 37 CFR 41.31; or	which places the r (3) a Request			
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(i)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	on.			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date thave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount chortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as			
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wind AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below the confliction in both confliction in both cases the confliction in both cases are not deemed to place the confliction in both cases.	nsideration and/or search (see NO¯ w);	ΓE below);				
<ul> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or</li> <li>(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a company of the present additional claims without canceling a company of the present additional claims without canceling a company of the present additional claims without canceling a company of the present additional claims without canceling a company of the present additional claims without canceling a company of the present additional claims without canceling a company of the present additional claims without canceling a company of the present additional claims without cancelling a company of the present additional claims without cancelling a company of the present additional claims without cancelling a company of the present additional claims without cancelling a company of the present additional claims without cancelling a company of the present additional claims without cancelling a company of the present additional claims.</li> </ul>			ne issues for			
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	sorresponding number of finally reju	scied ciaims.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).			
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>		timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the			
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: <u>None</u> . Claim(s) objected to: <u>None</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4.6 and 7</u> .		l be entered and an e	xplanation of			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bubecause applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a			
10.  ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  See Continuation Sheet.						
12.	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)					
/Michael G. Hartley/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1618	Jagadishwar R Samala Examiner Art Unit: 1618					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The amendments to the claims will not be entered because they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search.

Applicant asserts that Kim does not teach that nanparticles can be prepared by the aggregation of cucurbutril derivatives. This is not found persuasive because claims are directed to product by process. Even thoug product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process. In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed.Cir.1985).